



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/801,260

03/15/2004

Ichiro Fujimori

13912US04

2251

23446 7590 03/28/2008
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD
500 WEST MADISON STREET
SUITE 3400
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER

CAO, PHAT X

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2814

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10801260	3/15/2004	FUJIMORI, ICHIRO	13912US04

MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD
500 WEST MADISON STREET
SUITE 3400
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER

Phat X. Cao

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

2814	20080325
------	----------

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief filed 1/14/08 has been entered and considered. It is noted that with regard to the rejection(s) under McCormack, Appellant continuously fails to provide the evidences to support that why the capacitive and the resistive couplings formed by Applicant's shielding layer 80 would reduce the noise, but not the capacitive and the resistive couplings formed by McCormack's shielding layer 12 (as discussed on page 11 of Examiner's answer). With regard to the rejection(s) under Wei, Appellant just simply states that "the N-well 484 is not a shielding layer" (see page 21 of reply brief). However, Appellant has not provided any reasons whatsoever to support this assertion. For the rest of Appellant's arguments, no further response by the examiner is deemed necessary because the examiner's answer mailed on 11/15/07 is incorporated herein for reference. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

/Phat X Cao/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2814